

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ospto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

| APPLICATION NO. | F | ILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---|------|------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 09/741,926 12/20/2000 | | 12/20/2000 | Ronaldus Hermanus Theodorus Oosterholt | PHN 17,871 | 9624 | |
| 24737 | 7590 | 11/03/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | CTUAL PROP | KE, PENG | | | |
| P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510 | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | • | | 2174 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | 4 11 41 11 | 1 4 4 4 4 | |
|--|---|--|--|-------------|
| • | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | ., |
| <i>(</i> | | 09/741,926 | OOSTERHOLT E | ET AL. |
| Office Actio | n Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | · |
| | | Peng Ke | 2174 | |
| The MAILING DA Period for Reply | TE of this communication app | ears on the cover sheet wi | th the correspondence a | ddress |
| THE MAILING DATE OF - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If the period for reply specified after the period for reply is specified. - Failure to reply within the set or | TTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THIS COMMUNICATION. Iable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ed above, the maximum statutory period we extended period for reply will, by statute, the later than three months after the mailing See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 6(a). In no event, however, may a r within the statutory minimum of thir ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB | eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered time THS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | ,) | |
| 1) Responsive to cor | mmunication(s) filed on <u>12 Ju</u> | <u>ly 2004</u> . | | |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FIN | AL . 2b) ☐ This | action is non-final. | | |
| • | tion is in condition for allowarnce with the practice under <i>E</i> | • | • | e merits is |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | • |
| 4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/a 7) ☐ Claim(s) is. | re rejected. | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) file Applicant may not re Replacement drawing | s objected to by the Examine ed on is/are: a) acceed any objection to the engine sheet(s) including the correct ration is objected to by the Examine | epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyare ion is required if the drawing | nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 (| _ |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § | 119 | | | |
| a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of the application | s made of a claim for foreign * c) None of: pies of the priority documents pies of the priority documents ne certified copies of the prior from the International Bureau etailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have been i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | application No received in this Nationa | al Stage |
| Attachment(s) | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited Notice of Draftsperson's Pat | (PTO-892) ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | • | Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date | |
| | ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of I 6) Other: | nformal Patent Application (P) | TO-152) |

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/12/04. This action is final.

2. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, and 7 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 7/12/04, claims 1-14 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz (US 6,067,565) in view of Kulkarni et al. (US 6,310,630).

As per claim 1, Horvitz teaches a device for presenting information units, comprising history means for storing references to presentable information units into a history list, the history means comprising user operable navigation means for changing a current position in the history list (col 40, lines 1-63):

Examiner infers that the history list is a container that contains a list of the web pages, which are previously viewed by the user. Horvitz allows the user to view the pre-fetched web pages, and that would change the position of the web pages that were previously viewed by the user.

Art Unit: 2174

and presentation means for presenting an information unit referenced by the reference at the current position, and compilation means for user operably compiling a set of references to desired information units, wherein the compiled set of references includes both previously viewed and un-viewed information units (col. 40, lines 1-30), and storing the references of said set into the history list so as to present an information unit referenced by the compiled set in response to a user operating said navigation means (col 34, lines 19-46).

However, he fails to teach storing the references of said set according to the time of their inclusion.

Kulkarni et al. teaches storing the references of said set according to the time of their inclusion (col. 6, lines 45-50)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kulkarni et al.'s teaching with Horvitz's device in order to allow the users to view their browsing history in chronological order.

As per claim 2, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach the device as claimed in claim 1. Horvitz further teaches the navigation means comprising forward means for changing the current position in the history list to a reference stored more recently than the reference at the current position, the presentation means being adapted to present respective information units referenced by the compiled set in response to the user iteratively operating said forward means(col 40, lines 1-63).

Examiner infers that the feature which is disclosed by Horvitz that allows the user to navigate the web page using forward and back, and allowing the user to view the pre-fetched

Art Unit: 2174

web pages, which would change the position of the web page that were previously viewed by the user.

As per claim 3, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach the device as claimed in claim 2. Horvitz further teaches the compilation means being adapted to impose a user supplied order on the compiled set of references, and store the references into the history list in accordance with said order (col 34, lines 19-46).

As per claim 4, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach the device as claimed in claim 1. Horvitz further teaches the comprising bookmark means for storing a bookmark to the compiled set of references (col 14, lines 57- 68, col 15, lines 1-9, col 34, lines 19- 46), and storing the references of said set into the history list in response to the user selecting said bookmark (col 40, lines 1-63).

As per claim 5, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach the device as claimed in claim 1.

Horvitz further teaches the information units being retrieved from a remote server, the compilation means being adapted to start retrieving information units referenced by the compiled set independently of an operation of the navigation means (col 40, lines 1-63).

As per claim 6, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach an internet access terminal as a device as claimed in claim 1 (col 5, lines 47-59).

As per claim 7, it is rejection with same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 8, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above).

As per claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above).

As per claim 10, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above).

As per claim 11, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 12, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach method of claim 7. Horvitz further teaches a computer program product for performing, when executed on a computing device, the method as claimed in 7 (col 5, lines 49-53).

As per claim 13, Horvitz and Kulkarni et al. teach the device as claimed in clam 1. Horvitz further teaches wherein a first information unit reference by the compiled set is presented immediately (col. 6, lines 45-50).

As per clam 14, it is of the same scope as claim 13. (see rejection above)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- A) Horvitz fails to teach or suggests "compiling a set of reference ... including both previously viewed and unviewed information items and storing the reference ... according to the time of their inclusion into the history list"
 - B) Horvitz fails to teach or suggest user operating of said navigation means.

 Examiner disagrees
- A) Horvitz teaches allowing user to browse through the web pages stored in the user history. (col. 40, lines 35-39) Furthermore, Horvitz allows the user to download a set of web pages through the search engine. (col. 40, lines 10-30) As user browses through this set of web pages, part of this set becomes viewed information, and the other part remains unviewed. (col. 40, lines 10-30). However, Horvitz fails to sort the web pages based on their time of inclusion, and Kulkarni makes up for this. (col. 6, lines 45-50)

Art Unit: 2174

B) Horvitz allows the user to browse a set of web pages using the back and forward buttons. (col. 40, lines 20-25)

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100